REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-17 are pending and under consideration. Claims 9, 11, 15 and 16 are allowed. Claims 8 and 14 are objected to.

Independent claim 1 recites converting a result of the printing or information about the printer into a hypertext. The Examiner relies upon Wood. The Applicant previously argued that Wood does not teach this feature. However, the Examiner has not addressed this argument in the present Office Action. Instead, the Examiner has repeated the previous reasoning for the rejection. The previous arguments are re-presented herein, and a detailed response thereto is respectfully requested.

The Examiner relies upon column 4, lines 45-56 of Wood. This portion teaches that the computer 30 supports HTTP and responds by sending documents and data to the requester at the remote workstations. However, "supporting HTTP" is not necessarily "converting" to HTTP. Instead, this supporting could instead be handling of already-converted information.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner further clarify how the supporting of HTTP of Wood teaches the claimed converting to HTTP.

Independent claim 1 also recites using HTTP as a communication protocol between the client and the print server. Independent claim 7 recites using HTTP as a communication protocol. Independent claim 10 recites using HTTP as a communication protocol so as to receive print data to be printed from a client. Independent claim 12 recites receiving print data using HTTP.

The Examiner relies upon column 4, lines 37-59 of Wood. However, this portion states that HTTP uses TCP/IP as the underlying protocol for retrieving web pages from another computer. Krishnan, col. 4, ln. 56-59. Thus, this portion relates to retrieving web pages, not communication between client and print server. This portion also states that most communication tasks performed between two computers connected by the Internet use TCP or IP. However, just because HTTP uses these protocols does not imply that HTTP is used for other communications, such as the client/print server communications. This is because protocols other than HTTP may also use TCP/IP for communication.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is

requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____7- 20-06_____   By: _____

Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501